

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Specifically, favorable consideration of pending Claims 1-40 is respectfully requested.

### THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752; hereafter “Gupta”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and further requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

MPEP §2131 states, in part, that “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference,” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Under such guidance, the Applicant respectfully submits that Gupta fails to anticipate Claims 1 and 7.

More specifically, Gupta does not teach or suggest, at least, “expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,” as recited in **Claim 1**, nor does Gupta teach or suggest, at least, “causing a request for data from the server to be issued by the browser, wherein the request causes the server to expire cookies from the browser,” (emphasis added by Applicant) as recited in **Claim 7**.

It is noted that Gupta describes a browser sending a logout request to an application server (see Gupta, col. 13, lines 45-51). However, in contrast to

Claims 1 and 7, Gupta does not teach or even suggest that a cookie from the browser is expired in accordance with the transmission of the logout request from the browser to the application server. In fact, the only discussion regarding the expiration of a cookie refers to a cookie's expiration parameter that "defines the lifetime of the cookie (e.g., how long the cookie is valid for)," (Gupta, col. 6, lines 7 and 8). Tellingly, Gupta makes no attempt to associate the expiration parameter with the transmission of the logout request.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Gupta fails to anticipate Claims 1 and 7, and therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

I. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of what is alleged to have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and further requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 2** depends from Claim 1, and is therefore distinguishable over Gupta for at least the same reasons asserted above to distinguish Claim 1 over Gupta. More specifically, Gupta does not teach or suggest, at least, "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request," as recited in Claim 1. Gupta does not provide any suggestion or motivation which would render such feature obvious to one of ordinary skill, nor does the rejection advance any argument to that effect.

Therefore, in view of the fundamental deficiencies of Gupta with regard to Claims 1 and 2, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. Claims 3-6 and 8-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gupta in view of Wu, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551; hereafter “Wu”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as well, and further requests that this rejection also be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Applicant’s rebuttal to the points of rejection begins by, again, pointing out that Gupta does not describe the expiration of a cookie in any terms other than with regard to the expiration parameter which “defines the lifetime of the cookie (e.g., how long the cookie is valid for)” (see Gupta, col. 6, lines 7 and 8).

Further, the statement in item 12 of the outstanding Office Action that, “Wu has taught the method wherein multiple servers are logged out of by selection of a single logout link,” appears to be in direct contrast to a previous statement made in the previous Office Action of September 11, 2003, that “Wu has not expressly disclosed selecting a logout link or generating a logout page for display on a browser being used by the user.” Clarification of this point is respectfully requested.

Regardless, Wu does not provide any description of how the credential destruction process, which the rejection compares to expiring cookies, described therein is “pluggable” for a browser application, and therefore Wu does not even

offer a hint that either a logout link or a logout page would be utilized in such effort, as in the presently rejected independent claims. This point was made in the Applicant's previous response of December 2, 2003, and is deemed to be persuasive by the outstanding Office action.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Gupta and Wu is fundamentally deficient with regard to presently rejected claims 3-6 and 8-40. In particular, the proposed combination of references fails to teach or suggest:

- “expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,” in accordance with independent Claim 1 and dependent **Claims 3-6 and 33**;
- “causing a request for data from the server to be issued by the browser, wherein the request causes the server to expire cookies from the browser,” in accordance with independent Claim 7 and dependent **Claims 8, 9, and 34**;
- “providing a link to an expire cookies page on each server that when called causes each server to expire cookies on the user's browser...,” in accordance with independent **Claim 10** and dependent **Claim 35**;
- “a module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each server that when called causes each server to expire cookies on the user's browser...,” in accordance with independent **Claim 11**;
- “providing a link to an expire cookies page on each server that when called causes each server to expire cookies on the user's browser...,” in accordance with independent **Claim 15** and dependent **Claim 36**;

“building a page containing an expire cookies URL; sending requests to retrieve an image identified by each expire cookies URL; retiring stored cookies,” in accordance with independent **Claim 16** and dependent **Claim 37**;

- building a page containing an expire cookies URL; sending requests to retrieve an image identified by each expire cookies URL; retiring stored cookies,” in accordance with independent **Claim 17** and dependent **Claim 38**;
- “issuing get image requests to URLs identified by the image tags; retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests,” in accordance with independent **Claim 18** and dependent **Claims 19-23 and 39**;
- “providing a link to an expire cookies page on each server in the form of an image source tag that when called causes each server to expire cookies on both the server and user's browser, and to provide an image back to the browser upon succeeding in logging out the user,” in accordance with independent **Claim 24** and dependent **Claims 25-28 and 40**;
- “a plurality of image tags, each image tag corresponding to one of the multiple servers; each image tag providing a URL that causes a server associated with the image tag to expire cookies,” in accordance with independent **Claim 29** and dependent **Claim 30**; and
- “providing a URL in each image tag that causes a server associated with the image tag to expire cookies,” in accordance with independent **Claim 31** and dependent **Claim 32**.

Thus, the Applicant requests that the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION


The remaining reference of record has been considered. It is respectfully submitted that it does not compensate for the deficiencies of any of the references utilized in rejecting the pending claims.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early and forthright issuance of a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: May 14, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David S. Lee  
Reg. No. 38,222  
(206) 315-4001